REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9-37 remain in the present application.

103 Rejections

The present Office Action indicates Claims 1-6, 9-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al. (US Patent No. 6,115,743) in view of Smorgrav (US Patent No. 6,615,261). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Cowan reference and the Smorgrav reference, alone or together. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the Cowan and Smorgrav reference to teach the present claimed invention.

The present Office Action indicates Applicant's prior arguments are not persuasive. Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking time to discuss the present Application. Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the Claims in light of the following remarks and above listed amendments intended to emphasize the differences between the present invention and prior art in accordance with the Examiner interview.

Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan and/or Smorgrav references do not teach gathering communication device information, including actual configuration, performance and functionality characteristics of a communication device automatically. Even if the Cowan and/or Smorgav reference could be interpreted to teach gathering

communication device information, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan and/or Smorgrav references do not teach parsing the gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying an actual configuration, performance or functionality characteristic. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention reading in alarm data (emphasis added) from an external device and an inference engine to analyze the data [Col. 7 lines 1 – 10], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach parsing of communication device information is gathered by automatically generating and forwarding commands. Even if reading an alarm could be interpreted as parsing an alarm, Applicant respectfully assert the alarm initiated in an external device is not in response to automatically generated and forwarded commands. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention simplifying parsing of the expressions describing the derived (emphasis added) objects which are defined as a mathematical function of real objects by using arithmetic postfix notation [Col. 3 lines 25 – 40], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach parsing the gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of the communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network communications device, wherein the characteristic of the communications device is an actual (emphasis added) configuration, performance or functionality. Applicant respectfully asserts parsing an abstract mathematical expression does not teach parsing device information of actual configuration, performance or functionality.

The present Office Action alleges the Cowan and Smorgrav references teach net rules and net rule exception points. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention an inference engine to analyze alarm data [Col. 7 lines 1 – 10], Applicant respectfully

asserts the Cowan reference does not teach net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts that mere mention of an inference engine does not teach net rules and one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize a mere mention of an inference engine teaches net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts that reading alarm data and analyzing to detect network outages does not teach comparing (emphasis added) actual configuration, performance and functionality of the communication device to a set of established net rules comprising definitions of predefined thresholds for acceptable tolerances associated with different characteristics of the communication device. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention data collected from a network can be exploited manually or automatically [Col. 1 lines 25 – 30], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgav reference does not teach analyzing includes comparing actual configuration, performance and functionality of the communication device to a set of established net rules.

Even if the Cowan reference and/or the Smorgrav reference could be interpreted to teach net rules, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan and/or Smorgrav references do not teach net rule exceptions points. The net rule exception points provide a unifying metric for identifying problems and potential problems. The particular characteristics of devices can be different and have different threshold ranges that correspond net rule exception points, and the net rule exception points provide a unified metric. Applicant respectfully assert that mere mention of an inference engine for reading alarms in the Cowan reference and a mere mention of data can be exploited automatically in the Smorgrav reference does not teach net rule exception points.

In paragraph 2A of the "Response to Arguments" section, the present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference teaches automatically parsing the gathered

information. In paragraph 2 on page 7, the present Office Action seems to allege the background and summary of the Cowan reference teach manual inputs are automated by using a universal graphical interface. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention restoration systems require human intervention in which many restoration functions are performed by restoration staff [Col1 lines 27 – 30] and a graphical user interface reduces a need for keyed (emphasis added) commands [Col. 2 lines 1 – 5], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach gathering communication device information automatically by automatically generating and forwarding commands. To the extent the Cowan reference user interface may reduce "keyed" commands, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach the commands are generated automatically. Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference reliance on user input through the graphical user interface does not teach automatically gathering device information. Applicant respectfully directs attention to indications in the Cowan reference that Users (emphasis added), via RM terminals, provide respective graphical user interface GUI clients with commands and data (emphasis added) [Col. 5 lines 48 – 50] and restoration functions include sending manual restoration commands to restoration devices [Col. 7 lines 39 – 40].

The present Office Action also seems raise a mention of "unsolicited" alarm communication in Cowan as being significant. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention "unsolicited" (emphasis added) alarms, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach gathering communication device information automatically by automatically generating and forwarding commands. Applicant respectfully asserts an unsolicited alarm is not provided in response to a query command. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention a verification manager

process verifies current topology (emphasis added) and updates topology data and the verification manager process generally requires no human intervention [Col. 7 lines 47 – 51], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach gathering actual configuration, performance and functionality (emphasis added) characteristics of a communication device automatically. The present Office Action appears to allege that Figure 2 of the Cowen reference teaches automatically gathering information. Applicant respectfully asserts Figure 2 of the Cowan reference does not teach automatically gathering information. To the extent Figure 2 of the Cowan reference indicates that all communications between the fault analysis process 246 that reads in alarm data [Col. 7 line1] or update topology data in real time network device database 240, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference teaches away from the present invention by indicating in Figure 2 that nearly all processes are controlled by the graphical user interface GUI server 234 which receives user (emphasis added) commands from GUI clients 226 [Col. 5 lines 48 – 50]. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention in the rare event of an abnormal termination of a GUI client, a GUI server sends out a periodic hello message to a GUI client [Col. 8 lines 50 – 51] which the present Office Action characterizes as internal (emphasis added), Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach automatically gathering information on external communication devices.

The present Office Action alleges the Applicant's invention requires significant manual input and direct attention to alleged manual commands 1101 and 1111 shown in Figure 11A and 11B. Applicant respectfully asserts commands 1101 and 1111 shown in Figure 11A and 11B of the present Application are examples of commands automatically generated in the present invention. Applicant respectfully directs the

Examiner's attention to page 36 last paragraph and page 37 first paragraph of the present Application that indicates "The command 1101 in Figure 11A and the command 1111 in Figure 11B for gathering network communication device information are automatically (emphasis added) configured by on embodiment of the present invention in the appropriate syntax format for an optical concentrator". Applicant respectfully asserts the present invention automates collection, parsing, and analysis without requiring commands that are each manually initiated by a user, either by typing keyed command or necessarily individually triggered by a graphical user interface.

In paragraph 2B, the present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference teaches parsing the commands base upon much the same allegations as presented above. Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach parsing for reasons similar to the rational presented above. To the extent the Cowan reference may show a main window of a GUI on a RM terminal in Figure 11 or a device menu in Figure 16, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach parsing gathered communication device information automatically (emphasis added). To the extent the Cowan reference may mention a user (emphasis added) at a RM terminal with a GUI system can receive alerts, monitor restoration devices, and effectively monitor trunks [Col. 10 lines 12 –22], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach parsing gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of said communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network communications device, wherein the characteristic of said communications device is an actual configuration, performance or functionality characteristic of the communication device.

The present Office Action alleges analyzing and filtering data reads on parsing data. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention analyzing network problems [Col. 1 lines 28 – 345] and topology data is filtered [Col. 6 lines 30 – 35], Applicant respectfully assert the Cowan reference does not teach parsing gathered communication device information automatically. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference teaches away by indicating that analyzing network problems requires human intervention [Col. 1 lines 28 – 35] and a graphical interface is provided for monitoring or managing, including analyzing network problems [Col. 2 lines 1 – 2, Col. 3 lines 64 – 67]. Again, Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the repeated references in the Cowan reference where user intervention is required in the GUI system and to the extent the Cowan reference may mention keyed (emphasis added) commands are reduced [Col. 2 lines 1 – 5], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference emphasizes user interaction in a GUI system. Furthermore, with respect to the present Office Action allegation that filtering data reads on parsing automatically, to the extent the Cowan reference may mention an RTR database is populated with topology data that is filtered to populate an RTNDD [Col. 6 lines 30 – 35], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference teaches away by showing in Figure 2 that all information communicated from RTR is controlled and communicated via the user GUI server.

The present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference uses an inference engine to process external alarms and one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize to display an external alarm to a graphical user interface would require some sort of identification information especially if the alarm was "unsolicited". Applicant

respectfully asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would not readily recognize mere mention of an inference engine teaches parsing the gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of the communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network communications device, wherein the characteristic of the communications device is an actual configuration, performance or functionality characteristic of a communication device.

In paragraph 2C, the present Office Action seems to allege that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that to display an external alarm to a graphical user interface would require some sort of identification information. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention an inference engine and reading in alarms (emphasis added) from external systems [Col. 7 lines 1 – 5], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach gathering communication device information, including actual configuration, performance and functionality characteristics of a communication device automatically, wherein said communication device information is gathered by automatically generating and forwarding commands (emphasis added) and parsing the gathered communication device information automatically.

The present Office Action alleges the Smorgrav reference teaches using a parser. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention simplifying parsing of the expressions describing the derived (emphasis added) objects which are defined as a mathematical function of real objects by using arithmetic postfix notation [Col. 3 lines 25 – 40], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach parsing the gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying

portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of the communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network communications device, wherein the characteristic of the communications device is an actual (emphasis added) configuration, performance or functionality. Applicant respectfully asserts parsing an abstract mathematical expression does not teach parsing device information of actual configuration, performance or functionality.

In paragraph 2d the present Office Action seems to allege the Cowan reference and Smorgrav references teach automatically constructing queries. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention communications between a user (emphasis added) terminal and telecommunications devices include audit commands [Co. 2 lines 50 – 59], Applicant respectfully assert the Cowan reference does not teach automatically constructing queries. Applicant respectfully draws attention to the Cowan reference indication that a user (emphasis added) via RM terminals provide respective GUI clients with commands. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention a SNMP protocol supports retrieval of specific data objects from a network element in a query / reply fashion [Col. 1 lines 37 – 42], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach automatically constructing queries.

In paragraph 2e the present Office Action seems to allege the Cowan reference teaches an automated intelligent expert network communication device audit analysis process is utilized to analyze the performance of said communication device in a communication network. The present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference clearly uses the term "performance". To the extent the Cowan reference may use the " in describing a tab in a window that when selected (emphasis added) provides current

and historical performance data on network interface frontend (NIFTE) processes, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach an automated intelligent expert network communication device audit analysis process is utilized to analyze the performance of said communication device in a communication network.

In paragraphs 2f through 2h the present Office Action seems to repeat rejections on basis similar to those raised above. Applicant respectfully reiterates the arguments presented above.

In paragraph 2i the present Office Action alleges the Cowan and Smorgrav references teach net rules and the Applicant fails to define what is meant by net rules. Applicant respectfully directs attention to page 20 first paragraph of the present Application,

> "In one embodiment, net rules comprise definitions of predefined thresholds for acceptable tolerances associated with different characteristics of the network, for example different acceptable tolerances for components included in an optical concentrator. In one embodiment of the present invention, the net rules provide a standard by which the readiness and stability of a node is measured."

To the extent the Cowan reference may mention an inference engine to analyze alarm data, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts that mere mention of an inference engine does not teach net rules and one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize a mere mention of an inference engine teaches net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts that receiving alarm

data does not teach comparing (emphasis added) actual configuration, performance and functionality of the communication device to a set of established net rules comprising definitions of predefined thresholds for acceptable tolerances associated with different characteristics of the communication device. Applicant respectfully asserts that merely reading and analyzing the data to detect network outages does not teach net rules.

The present Office Action also alleges the Smorgrav reference teaches net rules. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention data collected from a network can be exploited manually or automatically [Col. 1 lines 25 – 30], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgav reference does not teach analyzing includes comparing actual configuration, performance and functionality of the communication device to a set of established net rules comprising definitions of predefined thresholds for acceptable tolerances associated with different characteristics of the communication device.

Even if the Cowan reference and/or the Smorgrav reference could be interpreted to teach net rules, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan and/or Smorgrav references do not teach net rule exceptions points. The present Office Action alleges that net rule exception points has not been defined. Applicant respectfully directs attention to page 20 through 22, Figure 4 and Figure 6 of the present Application. The net rule exception points provide a unifying metric for identifying problems and potential problems. The particular characteristics of devices can be different and have different threshold ranges that correspond net rule exception points, and the net rule exception points provide a unified metric. Applicant respectfully draws attention to the description of the various manipulations of net rule exception points described on page 28 and shown in Figure 4E of the present Application as a unified approach to

analyzing a network overall and components individually. Applicant respectfully assert that mere mention of an inference engine for reading alarms in the Cowan reference and a mere mention of data can be exploited automatically in the Smorgrav reference does not teach net rule exception points.

The present Office Action appears to restate many of the rejections from previous Office Actions. Applicants respectfully assert the cited references do not teach the Claimed invention and respectfully reiterate previous arguments. For convenience the Applicant respectfully presents the arguments below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest a system or method as recited in independent Claims 1, 12, 17, 26 and 31. Applicant respectfully reasserts that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest parsing gathered communication device information automatically. For example, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

> parsing said gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying portions of said communication device information and correlating the portions of said communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a device; ....

Applicant respectfully reasserts that the Cowan reference does not teach or suggest parsing gathered communication device information automatically. Applicant respectfully reasserts that to the extent the Cowan reference may teach communication of commands and data, the Cowan reference teaches away from the present claimed parsing by indicting the commands and data generation requires significant user

intervention [Col. 1 lines 28-35, Col. 2 lines 44-58, Col. 3 line 64 – Col. 4 line 11, Col. 5 lines 49-60, Col. 6 lines 30-35, Col. 7 lines 1-10, Col. 9 lines 23-67 and Col. 14 – 16].

The present Office Action alleges Smorgrav discloses using a parser [Col. 3 line 50 to Col. 4 line 47] to parse collected samples enabling for correlation of performance data so that graphical analysis may be performed [Col. 5 line 64 – Col. 6 line 37] to assist in network planning or trouble shooting, monitoring, as well as, generating readable reports [Col. 6 lines 32-38]. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention parsing of expressions describing derived objects in which values are defined as a mathematical function of real objects collected from the network elements [Col. 3 lines 40 – 59 and Col. 4 lines 24 – 27], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach parsing gathered communication device information automatically, including identifying portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of the communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network communications device, wherein the characteristic of the communications device is a configuration, performance or functionality characteristic. To the extent the Smorgrav reference is directed to parsing mathematical functions or expressions, Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach identifying portions of the communication device information and correlating the portions of the communication device information to an operation or characteristic of a network.

Applicant respectfully reasserts that the Cowan reference fails to teach or suggest analyzing characteristics and operations of the network communication device automatically as claimed in the present application. Applicant respectfully reasserts that to the extent the Cowan reference may teach fault analysis to detect network

outages [Col. 7 lines 1 – 10], the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing the characteristic and operations of the network communication device, including configuration, performance or functionality characteristics. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference teaches away from the present claimed analysis of the characteristics and operations of a network device by indicting the user sends commands and data implying the user does the analysis (abstract, col. lines 11-67, col. 3 line 64 – col. 5 line 56, col. 6 lines 30-67, col. 7 lines 1-10, col. 9 line 48 – col. 10 line 22, col. 10 line 65 –col. 11 line 58, col. 12 line 9 – col. 13 line 54, col. 14 line 29 – col. 15 line 9 and col. 16 lines 26-47).

The present Office Action alleges Smorgrav discloses using a parser [Col .3 line 50 to Col. 4 line 47] to parse collected samples enabling for correlation of performance data so that graphical analysis may be performed [Col. 5 line 64 – Col. 6 line 37] to assist in network planning or trouble shooting, monitoring, as well as, generating readable reports [Col. 6 lines 32-38]. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention presenting data object to analysis tools [Col. 5 line 65 to Col. 6 line 11] , Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach analyzing characteristics and operations of the network communications device automatically, including configuration, performance or functionality characteristics as claimed in the present application.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2 – 6 and 9 – 11, 13 –16, 18- 25, 27 – 30 and 32 – 37 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims 1, 12, 17, 26 and 30 respectively.

Regarding Claims 5 and 29, the present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference teaches constructing queries by issuing protocol commands formatted in the appropriate syntax for the communication device. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention sending control signals [Col. 4 line 61 to Col. 5 line 19], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach automatically constructing queries by issuing protocol commands formatted in the appropriate syntax for the communication device as claimed in the present application.

Regarding Claim 6, the present Office Action alleges the Cowan reference teaches analyzing the performance of the communication device. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention the performance option when selected provides current and historical performance data on NIFTE processes [Col. 13 lines 8 –12], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing the performance of the communication device as claimed in the present application.

Regarding Claims 9 –11 the present Office Action alleges Cowan teaches network analysis tool, {sic} detecting unsolicited alarms. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention user interfacing in the several cited sections, Applicants respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing parsed information. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention user terminals [Col. 2 lines 47-58] a GUI tool [Col. 6 lines 30-67] and an inference engine [Col. 7 line 4], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing parsed information. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention unsolicited alarms, Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing parsed information. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention a user can configure parameters that are read at startup and

runtime [Col. 9 lines 50 – 55], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing parsed information. To the extent the Cowan reference may mention a user can receive alerts [Col. 10 lines 15 –22], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach analyzing parsed information. Applicant respectfully asserts Cowan does not teach parsed communication device information is compared to values included in an expert network audit database of an intelligent backend as recited in Claim 10. Applicant respectfully asserts Cowan does not teach values included in the intelligent backend include thresholds parameters that indicate acceptable configuration, performance and functionality as recited in Claim 11.

With regards to claim 13, to the extent the Cowan reference may mention a device menu [Figure 16] to allow a user to select maintenance functions [Col. 12 lines 35 – 37], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach network communication device audit information includes device configuration information, performance level information, and identification of parameters that do not meet threshold levels.

With regards to claim 14, to the extent the Cowan reference may mention a pull down menu [Figure 11] that provides users with easy access to RTR system functions [Col. 11 lines 9 – 10], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach a network communication device audit report that has the same user friendly look and feel for a variety of devices across different architectures and is organized in a manner that facilitates network management and maintenance. Applicant respectfully asserts that a pull down menu of a single RTR system does not teach a look and feel for a variety of devices across different architectures. In addition, to the extent the functions

of the Cowan reference pull down menu are directed to guiding a user though RTR user interfaces such as a file option, refresh option, change password option, etc., [Col. 11 lines 9 – 59], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach a network communication device audit report that is organized in a manner that facilitates network management and maintenance.

Regarding Claim 15, to the extent Cowan reference may mention a fault analysis [Col. 7 lines 1 –10], an RTR GUI system provides real time displays [Col. 10 lines 12-22], a main menu of a GUI [Col. 10 line 65 to Col. 11 line 65], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach a network communication device audit report presents information associated with different areas of network management impact.

Regarding claims 18-23 and 32-36, the present Office Action acknowledges that the Cowan reference fails to show using net rules. Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cowan reference. The present Office Action alleges the Smorgrav discloses using a parser [Col. 3 line 50 - Col. 4 line 47] to parse collected samples enabling for correlation of performance data so that graphical analysis may be performed [Col. 5 line 64 – Col. 6 line 37] to assist in network planning or trouble shooting, monitoring, as well as, generating readable reports [Col. 6 lines 32-38]. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention parsing of expressions describing derived objects where the derived objects are an object which values are defined as a mathematical function of real objects collected from the network elements [Col. 3 lines 40 – 59 and Col. 4 lines 24 – 27], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach determining the

characteristics of a communication device, comparing the results to a set of established net rules, and identifying net rule exceptions.

With respect to Claim 19 and 33, To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention parsing of expressions describing derived objects where the derived objects are an object which values are defined as a mathematical function of real objects collected from the network elements [Col. 3 lines 40 – 59 and Col. 4 lines 24 – 27], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach established net rules comprise definitions of predefined thresholds for acceptable tolerances associated with different characteristics of the communication device including different acceptable tolerances for components of an optical concentrator.

With respect to Claim 20 and 34, To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention parsing of expressions describing derived objects where the derived objects are an object which values are defined as a mathematical function of real objects collected from the network elements [Col. 3 lines 40 – 59 and Col. 4 lines 24 – 27], Applicant respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach a communication device audit methodology includes the assignment of net rule exception points (NREPS) to identified net rule exceptions.

With respect to Claim 11 and 35, To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention parsing of expressions describing derived objects where the derived objects are an object which values are defined as a mathematical function of real objects collected from the network elements [Col. 3 lines 40 – 59 and Col. 4 lines 24 – 27], Applicant

respectfully asserts the Smorgrav reference does not teach net rule exception points are used to identify problems and potential problems.

Regarding Claim 24, to the extent the Cowan reference may mention a user sends instructions and receives back data related to the status of network devices [abstract, Col. 2 lines 11-67, Col. 3 line 64 – Col. 5 line 56, Col. 6 line 30-67, Col. 7 lines 1-10, Col. 9 line 48 – Col. 10 line 22, Col. 10 line 65 – Col. 11 line 58, Col. 12 line 9 – Col 13 line 54, Col.14 line 29 – Col. 15 line 9, Col. 16 lines 26 –47 and Figure 11], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cowan reference does not teach an intelligent backend identifies potential causes of a problem.

Regarding claims 25, 30 and 37, previous Office Actions acknowledged that the Cowan reference failed to show providing a suggestive course of action for a problem. Applicant respectfully reasserts that the Smorgrav reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cowan reference. To the extent the Smorgrav reference may mention data collected can be exploited by report generators, correlation tools and systems that can respond to anomalies by actively doing reconfiguration to solve a detected problem [Col. 1 lines 27 – 30] , Applicant respectfully assert the Smorgrav reference does not teach providing a suggested corrective course of action for a problem as claimed in the present application.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts the present Claimed invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Cowan nor Smorgrav references, alone or together

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 11/23/, 2005

John F. Ryan
Reg. No. 47, 050
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060